

University of Toronto  
Faculty of Law

Course materials for

*Land Use Planning  
&  
Local Government Law*

ERAN S. KAPLINSKY

LAW 584 H1 F + LAW 224 H1 S  
September 2006 2012

These materials are solely for the use of students  
in the Faculty of Law, University of Toronto

KE  
5295  
.A7K36  
2006  
c.1

BORA LASKIN LAW LIBRARY

AUG 30 2006

FACULTY OF LAW  
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

University of Toronto  
Faculty of Law

Course materials for

# ***Land Use Planning & Local Government Law***

ERAN S. KAPLINSKY

LAW 584H1F + LAW 224H1S  
September 2006  
2012

These materials are solely for the use of students  
in the Faculty of Law, University of Toronto



## **Land Use Planning & Local Government Law**

*LAW584H1F – 3 credits; 2 hours*

*First term, Thursdays 2:10–4:00*

The course explores the legal framework for implementing urban and land use policy. The course begins with some controversial questions: What is the nature of local government, and what powers should municipalities have? When should development be regulated and when left to the market? The course proceeds to examine a range of planning tools, both public (official plans, zoning, subdivision controls, development agreements and financial incentives, and antisprawl legislation) and private (e.g., nuisance, restrictive covenants, and homeowner associations), focusing on their relative efficacy and fairness. The rights of landowners and other affected parties will also be discussed, as will the ability of administrative and quasi-judicial agencies to review municipal decisions and to resolve land use disputes. Planning and economic theory will be applied to contemporary debates over issues such as “smart growth” and sprawl, urban design, and housing affordability.

- Evaluation: 2¼-hour, open-book examination, or a paper of 20–25 pages on a topic approved by the instructor.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction to Local Government Law</b>	<b>1</b>
A.	Municipal Power: the Traditional Approach . . . . .	1
	“Dillon’s Rule” and the <i>Ultra Vires</i> Doctrine . . . . .	1
	<i>Shell Canada Products Ltd. v. Vancouver (City)</i> . . . . .	1
B.	Empowering Local Governments . . . . .	15
	<i>Nanaimo (City) v. Rascal Trucking Ltd.</i> . . . . .	15
	<i>Spraytech v. Hudson (Town)</i> . . . . .	19
	<i>City of Toronto Act</i> (excerpts) . . . . .	27
<b>2</b>	<b>Introduction to Land Use Planning and Regulation</b>	<b>29</b>
A.	The Need for Planning . . . . .	29
	David Hume, <i>A Treatise of Human Nature</i> . . . . .	29
	Arthur C. Pigou, <i>The Economics of Welfare</i> . . . . .	29
	Ronald Coase, “The Problem of Social Cost” . . . . .	29
	William A. Fischel, <i>The Economics of Zoning</i> (1985) . . . . .	30
B.	Markets or Governments? . . . . .	30
	C. Bohl, “Should Government Regulate Urban Planning?” . . . . .	30
	M. Pennington, “Should Government Regulate Urban Planning?” . . . . .	37
<b>3</b>	<b>Planning and Plans</b>	<b>41</b>
A.	The Meaning of Planning . . . . .	41
	Carrothers, <i>Planning in Manitoba</i> (1956) . . . . .	41
	<i>Planning Act</i> , s. 1.1 . . . . .	41
B.	The Role of the Province . . . . .	41
	<i>Planning Act</i> , ss. 2–3, 23 . . . . .	41
	<i>Provincial Policy Statement</i> (2005) . . . . .	42
	Ministerial Orders (s. 47) . . . . .	44
	Ministerial Zoning Order, May 8, 2006 (regarding the Caledonia Dispute) . . . . .	44
C.	The Municipal “Official” Plan . . . . .	45
	From the <i>Provincial Policy Statement</i> (2005): . . . . .	45
	<i>Planning Act</i> , ss. 16–22, 27 . . . . .	45


D.	The Contents of the Official Plan . . . . .	46
	<i>Toronto (City) v. Goldlist Properties Inc.</i> . . . . .	46
E.	The Legal Effect of the Plan . . . . .	49
	<i>Planning Act</i> , s. 24 . . . . .	49
	<i>Bele Himmel Investments Ltd. v. Mississauga (City)</i> . . . . .	49
	<i>Re Cadillac Development Corp. Ltd. v. Toronto (City)</i> . . . . .	50
	<i>Old St. Boniface Residents Assn. v. Winnipeg (City)</i> . . . . .	51
F.	How Land Use Decisions are Really Made . . . . .	56
<b>4</b>	<b>Introduction to Zoning</b> . . . . .	<b>59</b>
A.	<i>Planning Act</i> , s. 34 etc. . . . .	59
B.	<i>Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co.</i> . . . . .	61
C.	Robert H. Nelson, "Zoning Myth and Practice: From Euclid Into the Future" . . . . .	65
<b>5</b>	<b>The Limits of Zoning Powers</b> . . . . .	<b>71</b>
A.	"Spot Zoning" and Discrimination . . . . .	71
	<i>Scarborough (Township) v. Bondi</i> . . . . .	71
	<i>North York (Township), Re</i> . . . . .	74
B.	Regulating the Use ( <i>not</i> the User) . . . . .	76
	<i>R. v. Bell</i> . . . . .	76
	<i>Barrie (City) v. Brown Camps Residential &amp; Day Schools</i> . . . . .	80
	<i>Planning Act</i> , ss. 35(2)–(3) . . . . .	82
C.	Bad Faith . . . . .	82
	<i>H.G. Winton Ltd. v. North York (Borough)</i> . . . . .	82
	<i>Entreprises Sibeca Inc. v. Frelighsburg (Municipality)</i> . . . . .	87
D.	Fettering . . . . .	90
	<i>Pacific National Investments Ltd. v. Victoria (City)</i> . . . . .	90
E.	Prohibitory Zoning . . . . .	105
	<i>Russell v. Toronto (City)</i> . . . . .	105
	<i>R. v. Konakov</i> . . . . .	108
<b>6</b>	<b>The Rights of Landowners</b> . . . . .	<b>111</b>
A.	The Right to a Non-Conforming Use . . . . .	111
	<i>Planning Act</i> , ss. 34(8)–(9) . . . . .	111
	<i>Central Jewish Institute v. Toronto (City)</i> . . . . .	111
	<i>Saint-Romuald (Ville) v. Olivier</i> . . . . .	115
B.	The Right to a Building Permit . . . . .	122
	<i>City of Toronto v. Toronto R.C. Separate School Trustees</i> . . . . .	122
	<i>Building Code Act</i> , S.O. 1992, c. 23 . . . . .	124
	<i>Building Code Act</i> , O. Reg. 403/97 . . . . .	125
	<i>Woodglen &amp; Co. v. North York (City)</i> . . . . .	126



<b>7 Zoning and its Critics</b>	<b>129</b>
A. James Kunstler, <i>Home from Nowhere</i> . . . . .	129
B. W. Block, <i>Is Zoning Obsolete?</i> . . . . .	131
<b>8 Beyond Zoning</b>	<b>135</b>
A. Variances . . . . .	135
<i>Fred Doucette Holdings Ltd. v. Waterloo (City)</i> . . . . .	135
B. Bonusing: Bargaining for Development Rights? . . . . .	141
<i>Planning Act</i> , s. 37 . . . . .	141
<i>1430 Yonge Street Inc. v. Toronto (City)</i> . . . . .	142
<i>City of Toronto, s. 37 Implementation Guidelines</i> . . . . .	145
<i>Lambert v. Whistler (Resort Municipality)</i> . . . . .	155
C. Site Plan Agreements . . . . .	157
<i>Planning Act</i> , s. 41. . . . .	157
<i>Polla v. Toronto (City) Chief Building Official</i> . . . . .	159
D. Interim Control . . . . .	164
<i>Planning Act</i> , ss. 36, 38, and 39 . . . . .	164
<i>Equity Waste v. Halton Hills (Town)</i> . . . . .	165
Note: <i>Loralgia Management Ltd. v. Oshawa (City)</i> . . . . .	172
<b>9 Role of the Ontario Municipal Board</b>	<b>173</b>
Introduction . . . . .	173
A. <i>Re Hopedale Developments Ltd. and Town of Oakville</i> . . . . .	173
B. <i>Ontario Municipal Board Act</i> , R.S.O. 1990, c. O.28 . . . . .	177
C. <i>Re Cloverdale Shopping Centre Ltd. et al. v. Township of Etobicoke</i> . . . . .	177
D. Ontario, Ontario Municipal Board Reform - Consultation Paper # 3 . . . . .	184
<b>10 Subdivision Control</b>	<b>191</b>
A. James Lorimer, <i>The Developers</i> . . . . .	191
B. The Right(?) to Subdivide Land . . . . .	194
<i>Re Corporation of the District of Surrey</i> . . . . .	194
<i>Re Forfar and East Gwillimbury</i> . . . . .	194
<i>Vancouver (City) v. Simpson</i> . . . . .	194
C. The Approval Process . . . . .	194
<i>Planning Act</i> , part VI – Subdivision of Land . . . . .	194
<i>Sare v. Sibley (Unorganized Township)</i> . . . . .	197
<i>Re District of Delta</i> . . . . .	200
D. Conditions of Subdivision Approval . . . . .	202
<i>Re Mills and Land Division Committee of the Reg. Mun. of York</i> . . . . .	202
<i>Maple View Farms Ltd. v. Vaughan (City)</i> . . . . .	204
<i>Brittannia North Holdings Inc. v. Mississauga (City)</i> . . . . .	205
<i>Mississauga (City) v. Brittannia North Holdings Inc.</i> . . . . .	210

<b>11 Development Charges</b>	<b>213</b>
A. “Growth = Needs = Taxes” . . . . .	213
B. <i>Development Charges Act</i> . . . . .	214
C. <i>Planning Act</i> , ss. 51, 53 . . . . .	218
D. “Charges Going Up On New Homes, Condos” . . . . .	218
E. Fischel, “The Economics of Land Use Exactions” . . . . .	218
<b>12 Growth Management</b>	<b>221</b>
A. The Problem, Or Not, of Urban Sprawl . . . . .	221
B. David Gurin, <i>Understanding Sprawl</i> (2003) . . . . .	221
C. Wendell Cox, “Smart Growth”: Threatening Quality of Life (2004) . . . . .	243
D. Green belts and Urban Containment . . . . .	277
Ontario Greenbelt Act . . . . .	277
Wendell Cox, “Myths about Urban Growth and the Toronto “GreenBelt” . . . . .	279
Anthony Downs, “Have Housing Prices Risen Faster in Portland Than Elsewhere?” . . . . .	279
<b>13 Heritage Conservation</b>	<b>289</b>
A. Ontario, <i>Backgrounder: Protecting Ontario's Heritage</i> (2005) . . . . .	289
B. Ministry of Culture, <i>Ontario's Heritage Conservation Districts</i> . . . . .	290
C. <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> . . . . .	290





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/coursematerials00kapl>

